

### REMARKS

Claims 10-18 remain pending in the above-referenced application and are submitted for the Examiner's reconsideration.

Regarding the prior art rejection, claim 10 (as well as claim 14) comprises several features, each of which contributes to the invention in combination with the other features of the claim. In this regard, the comments of the Examiner do not consider the combining effect of the claim features helping to reach the objectives of the invention.

Hence, searching for separate hints towards different aspects, e.g., "zero forcing and minimum mean-square-error equalization for multi-user detection in CDMA channels" as stated in KLEIN, does not mean the skilled person would combine KLEIDER and KLEIN to reach subject-matter of claim 10, because still s/he would not even know how to reach the objectives of the invention, e.g., to cancel ISI and/or MAI at the sender and hence allow a significant simplification of the hardware at the receiving side.

The skilled person – without knowing the subject-matter of claim 10 – would not have arrived at the solution provided by the invention, because none of the documents reveals to him/her any such hint as to how the objectives of the invention could be reached. Hence, the comment set forth by the Examiner appears to be an argument of hindsight, i.e. including the knowledge of the solution suggested by the present invention. Otherwise, the skilled person could not have arrived at the subject-matter of claim 10.

In addition, combining distinct aspects of several documents still leaves open the question as to why and how these aspects would be combined by the skilled person in order to arrive at claimed subject-matter.

Here, starting from KLEIDER it is not at all foreseeable why the skilled person would combine two more documents BRUCKERT and KLEIN and how s/he would arrive at subject-matter of claim 10, in particular as KLEIN refers to the receiver and not to pre-equalization in a modulator at the transmitter end. So the features presented in KLEIN would make no sense at the transmitter side.

The general-purpose article of KLEIN does not at all help to arrive at claimed subject-matter, because the skilled person would not consider this document to reach the object of this invention.

It is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of the present application is new, non-obvious, and useful. Prompt consideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON LLP

*R. B. A. No. 41772*

Dated: 12/19/06

By:

*Gerard A. Messina*

Gerard A. Messina

Reg. No. 35,952

One Broadway  
New York, NY 10004  
(212) 425-7200